

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed October 30, 2003, claims 1, 2, 8 and 11 were initially rejected as anticipated by Duxbury.

Duxbury teaches a system whereby a user physically logs into a server (see column 1 lines 62 to 65). It is basically a user role monitoring system (see column 1 lines 39 ff). One of the features of the monitoring program is the ability for a normal user to be granted supervisor rights (see column 2 lines 48 and 49; and column 5 lines 50, 51) and then, using a special shell script on the server, having these supervisor rights removed on exit (see column 4 lines 28 and 29). The invention of Duxbury is specifically for managing users and user status on a server whereas the present invention is specifically designed to have no users on the server. In the present invention, there are no users that log on to the server. Rather, according to the method of the present invention, the supervisor user is removed and no other users are available to take its place on a temporary basis. To infer the limitations of claims 1 and 8, the independent claims as now amended, from Duxbury is only with the benefit of hindsight given the teaching of the present application. In particular, claims 1 and 8 are amended to clarify the present method, so that now, rather than claim the removal of supervisor rights, the removal of the supervisor user is now claimed. No new subject matter is added. In applicant's view, the teaching of Duxbury if anything leads away from the present invention, as now claimed, in requiring there to be users on the server, there being no teaching nor suggestion otherwise.

Examiner also rejected claims 1, 2, 8 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. s 103(a) as unpatentable over Boebert in view of Duxbury. The remaining independent claim, claim 13, was also rejected as unpatentable in view of Duxbury, when combined with Boebert2 and Theimer.

Applicant re-iterates the above comments with regards to Duxbury. Applicant respectfully traverses Examiner's interpretation of the relevance of the teaching of Boebert to the present application. The Boebert references are concerned with the transport of data between a client and a server and is utilized very much like SSL (see column 3 lines 25-30). However the present invention deals with the security of the server. The whole point of the present invention

is that the user does not need to login to the server computer in order to lock and/or unlock the server. Indeed, it is not possible to login to the server in the present invention whether the line is secure or unsecure. Physical login to the server by any user is not allowed while the server is locked, because there are no valid passwords maintained on the system. In applicants view, it would not have been possible to combine the teaching of Boebert and Duxbury as stated by the Examiner to come to the present invention without, again, the benefit of hindsight given the present application. The teaching of Theimer would not lead one without the benefit of hindsight to combining the teaching of Boebert and Duxbury.

The balance of the independent claims are, it is submitted, patentable for at least the reason that they depend from independent claims which distinguish over the prior art.

With regards to the teaching of Truong, Examiner is asked to note that Truong is really only a different type of FTP (File Transfer Protocol) and does not add any teaching that could be used in the present invention. Truong does not edit the data files on the server. Rather Truong moves the files to the client, edits the files and transports them back, whereas the present invention manipulates the files in place on the server. The client can maintain an FTP session for the purpose of transporting files between the client and the server. Truong at column 8 line 44 "The file selection input identifies the file name of the file selected by the user. In response...the text of the file to the web browser of the client for editing. The file may then be edited and sent back". As with the other cited references, the Truong reference is unrelated to the present invention. Combining the teaching of Truong with the other cited references, absent some taught motivation or suggestion to do so, is, as with the other cited references, only with the impermissible use of hindsight.

With regards to Examiner's citation of the Wu reference, applicant agrees with the Examiner with respect to the username, password and other identifiers being used to authenticate users to login to a specific computer. However, applicant submits that, in the context of the present invention, it is unique and novel. That is, the methodology for authentication is similar, but the methodology post authentication is novel and, absent any teaching or suggestion by Wu, unobvious over Wu. Again to re-iterate, Duxbury does not teach a methodology for removing the root user from the server. Duxbury teaches a methodology for temporarily granting